



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,525	01/25/2001	Michael Hrabik	881075/3	5856

7590 10/25/2004

Joel E. Lutzker, Esq.
SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

JACKSON, JENISE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

24

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/770,525

Applicant(s)

HRABIK ET AL.

Examiner

Jenise E Jackson

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21-22 are sill rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messmer in view of Hill, and further view of Newton's Telecom Dictionary.

3. As per claims above, Messmer teaches outsourcing intrusion detection. Messmer also teaches that Counterpane manages intrusion-detection services, by having a black box that is located on a companies network. Thus, the Examiner asserts that by having the black box sensor that is located on the network, this constitutes a security subsystem, because the security subsystem continuously monitors and collects data and transmits the information to Counterpane's data center(i.e. Master system). Also, because the Applicant provides no specific definition of a master system, the Examiner broadly interprets a master system to be any system that analyzes information from the subsystem, because Messmer teaches that all data from customer's network is transmitted to the Counterpane's data center, than Messmer teaches a Master system. Further, Messmer teaches that the subsystem(i.e. black box) without human control is configured to correlate events across a plurality of devices associated with the network of computers and detect attacks on the computer, because Messmer teaches that a probe or "black box sensor" is put on the customer's network(i.e. target network) to accept audit data from a wide range of devices. Further, Messmer teaches that the black box sensor captures

Art Unit: 2131

syslog and audit outputs from Windows NT, Solaris, Linux servers; firewalls; ISS and intrusion detection software. Further, master system(i.e. Counterpane's data center) registers information pertaining to attacks detected by the security subsystem(i.e. black box), because Messmer teaches that the black box regularly transmits the network activity output to the master system(i.e. data centers). Furthermore, Messmer teaches that the data that is transmitted to the master system(i.e. data center) are footprints of attacks, and the data center has analysts that are trained to understand them. Lastly, Messmer teaches that the security subsystem(i.e. black box) and the master system(i.e. Counterpane's data center) communicates by using encryption, because Messmer teaches that the Counterpane's black box regularly transmits the network activity output in encrypted form to Counterpane's data center(i.e. master system). Further, the data that is transmitted is outputted to the master system, and registered so the information can be viewed by analysts. However, Messmer is silent on the security subsystem responding to the detected attacks. However, Hill discloses the security subsystem(i.e. agent) responds to the detected attacks(see col. 8, lines 12-17). Further, Hill discloses the security subsystem responds to detected attacks by selectively reporting a status of the network of computers to the master system(i.e. processor)(see col. 4, lines 53-61, col. 8, lines 12-21), and by testing the security subsystem(see col. 2, lines 66-67), allows the subsystem to respond to detected attacks by selectively reporting, testing, and implementing countermeasures(see col. 3, lines 1-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Messmer with Hill to include the security subsystem responding to detected attacks, the motivation it that the security subsystem responding to detected attacks is a method that provides network manager with help that may be overwhelmed with both responding to an attack and

Art Unit: 2131

providing operational control and messages thorough the network(see col. 2, lines 50-53 of Hill et al.). Therefore, Hill system provides a network manager with knowledge of the severity and overall nature of the attack, and recommended actions(see col. 2, lines 54-56 of Hill).

4. The Examiner asserts that since the Applicant does not provide a definition of a secure link(i.e. channel). The Examiner looks towards Newton's Telecom Dictionary. According to Newton's Telecom Dictionary, a secure channel(i.e. link) is defined as technology that provides privacy, integrity, and authentication in point-to-point communication(see pg. 636). Thus, the Examiner asserts that the encryption taught in Messmer-Hill, is a secure channel, because encrypting insures that information is protected from unauthorized viewing or use; therefore, insuring privacy, and integrity is maintained because if information is private the information cannot be manipulated, and authentication because in encryption in order to decode the information one must have the corresponding key to decode. Thus, the motivation to have an encrypted channel(i.e. link) is that the information that is sent between the two points of security subsystem and the master system is kept private and integrity is kept, and both parties can be authenticated, and thus prevents intruders or unauthorized users from manipulating information.

5. As per independent claims 11, 21-22, and also dependent claims 3, 6, 15, 19, limitations have already been addressed see claim 1 above. Also, claims 11, 21-22, 3, 6, 15, 19 include a master system hierarchically independent from the security subsystem. The Examiner asserts that Messmer discloses this because Messmer teaches that the master system(i.e. data center) is located in California or Virginia and that all data located on customer's network is transmitted to the master system. Also, the master system monitors the security subsystem around the clock, and the master system and Messmer also teaches that the master system is outsourced intrusion

Art Unit: 2131

detection. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the Master system is hierarchically independent from the security subsystem.

6. As per claims 4, 7, Messmer teaches that a security subsystem is hierarchically subordinate to the master system, because Messmer teaches that the customer's network has a black box sensor that correlates all the information from devices on the customer's network(see claim 1, above), and this information is transferred to the Master system. Further, the master system(i.e. data center) of Messmer tells customers how to handle intrusions. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that the security subsystem is subordinate to the master system.

7. As per claims 14, 18, Messmer teaches that the detection means(i.e. black box sensor) is one or more selected from the group consisting of an intrusion detection system, firewall and security subsystem. The Examiner asserts that Messmer meets this limitation, because the black box sensor detects attack on the network.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2, 8, 12, 16, 20 are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messmer in view of Hill, and Newton's Telecom Dictionary, and further in view of Kurtzberg et al.

10. As per the claims above, Messmer, Hill, and Newton's Telecom Dictionary teach comparing pseudo-attack(i.e. training attacks) to the attacks detected by the security system(see

Art Unit: 2131

col. 3, lines 20-36 of Hill). However, Messmer, Hill, and Newton's Telecom Dictionary do not disclose testing a system by having a psuedo(i.e. simulated) attack generator for generating attacks on the computer. However, Kurtzberg et al. discloses testing a system by having a psuedo(i.e. simulated) attack generator for generating attacks on the computer(see col. 3, lines 21-28).

11. It would have been obvious to modify Messmer, Hill and Newton's Telecom Dictionary, with Kurtzberg et al, the motivation to include a psuedo attack generator for generating attacks is this method of testing insures that integrity is maintained by testing the security subsystem thereby protecting the network form unauthorized penetrations (see col. 1, lines 35-40 of Kurtzberg et al.). Thus, integrity of a computer system can be tested reliably to improve or complement the system performance(see col. 1, lines 65-67 of Kurtzberg).

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messmer, Hill in view of Newton Telecom Dictionary, and further in view of Kurtzberg as applied to claim 8 above.

13. As per claim 9, the Examiner asserts that Messmer discloses this because Messmer teaches that the master system(i.e. data center) is located in California or Virginia and that all data located on customer's network is transmitted to the master system. Also, the master system monitors the security subsystem around the clock, and the master system and Messmer also teaches that the master system is outsourced intrusion detection. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the Master system is hierarchically independent from the security subsystem.

Art Unit: 2131

14. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messmer, Hill, in view of Newton Telecom Dictionary, and further in view of Kurtzberg as applied to claim 8 above.

15. As per claim 10, Messmer teaches that a security subsystem is hierarchically subordinate to the master system, because Messmer teaches that the customer's network has a black box sensor that correlates all the information from devices on the customer's network(see claim 1, above), and this information is transferred to the Master system. Further, the master system(i.e. data center) of Messmer tells customers how to handle intrusions. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that the security subsystem is subordinate to the master system.

Response To Amendment

16. The Applicant has states that the limitations that have been added are not meet by prior art, the Applicant is urged to look at paragraph one, specifically, in regards to the new limitations Hill has been used to address these limitations.

17. The Applicant states that Messmer's black box is a dumb box that simply passes information through. The Examiner disagrees. Messmer's black box captures output from a plurality of devices, and transmits this information to the master system.

Action is Final, Necessitated by Amendment

Art Unit: 2131

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E Jackson whose telephone number is (703) 306-0426. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-0040 for regular communications and (703) 308-6306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/770,525

Page 9

Art Unit: 2131

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized, cursive 'J' followed by a horizontal line.

August 22, 2004